

### REMARKS

This document responds to the final office action dated November 24, 2010. No claims are being amended, added, or cancelled. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

#### Interview Summary

Applicant thanks Examiner Wasel for the courtesy of the telephone interview with the undersigned representative on January 19, 2011. Applicant appreciated the opportunity to describe the claims and the important advantages achieved from the claimed subject matter. Applicant noted features of the independent claims that the Gross reference does not disclose. Examiner Wasel requested that Applicant submit an after-final response detailing such distinctions. Accordingly, Applicant submits this response.

#### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The office action (at page 2) rejected all pending claims 1-6 and 8-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being allegedly anticipated by Gross (US Pat. No. 5,555,346).<sup>1</sup> Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

First, regarding independent claim 1, Gross fails to disclose a GUI that includes a rule-editing area that is configured to display a condition input field set and an action input field set, ***“wherein the condition input field set and the action input field set are not displayed concurrently with each other.”*** (Independent claim 1.) The office relies on the “user interface 70” of FIG. 10 of Gross as allegedly disclosing this claim language. Assuming for the sake of argument that Gross’s user interface 70 disclosed the recited “condition input field set” and “action input field set” (an issue Applicant does not concede), Gross’s user interface concurrently displays such input fields sets.

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicant notes that the office action’s reference to “Cross et al . . . US Patent No. 6,282,565” appears to be a typographical error. (Office action, at page 2.)

Second, regarding independent claim 1, Gross fails to disclose a GUI that includes a rule preview area configured to provide a display of a user-understandable representation of the rule comprising both the conditions and the action, ***“the rule preview area being displayed both while the condition input field set is displayed and while the action input field set is displayed.”*** (Independent claim 1.) The office relies on Gross's “tuples 72” and “actions 74” that are illustrated in FIG. 10 of Gross. Gross's tuples 72 and actions 74, however, are not presented in Gross's user interface 70. Indeed, Gross states that “[t]he structured rule editor implements rules so that the rule syntax and constructs are not presented to the user.” (Gross, at 9:64-66.)

Third, regarding independent claim 1, Gross fails to disclose a GUI that includes ***“a condition input field set for accepting a first user specification of . . . a choice between an ‘and’ logical operator and an ‘or’ logical operator for logically connecting two or more of the conditions.”*** The office relies on the “user interface 70” of FIG. 10 of Gross as allegedly disclosing this claim language. The user interface 70, however, does not accept user specification of such a choice between an “and” logical operator and an “or” logical operator.

Independent claims 15-18 include similar claim language and are patentable for at least the same reasons. Dependent claims 2-6 and 8-14 are patentable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1, and for the independently patentable features recited therein.

### Conclusion

Applicant submits that claims 1-6 and 8-18 are in condition for allowance, and requests that the Examiner issue a notice of allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Applicant : Janaki Kumar  
Serial No. : 10/777,420  
Filed : February 12, 2004  
Page : 11 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 13906-0172001 / 2004P00084 US

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 24, 2011

/Andrew Dommer/

Andrew Dommer

Reg. No. 65,758

Customer Number 32864  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
Telephone: (612) 335-5070  
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945

60678781.doc